

## **REMARKS**

### **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

The final Office Action mailed January 31, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully considered. Claims 28-35 are pending in the present application. Claim 29 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of this claim in this or another application. Each of claims 28 and 32 have been amended in part to recite that the first set of threaded fasteners separately attach said adapter body to said motor drive assembly and wherein said second set of threaded fasteners separately attach said adapter body to said pump assembly. The claims have been further amended to recite the feature of at least one registration pin that provides radial alignment of the adapter body relative to the pump assembly. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections against the claims are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

## **OFFICE ACTION**

### **REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

(1) Claims 28-30 and 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Veyrat (U.S. Patent No. 4,797,071) in view of Martin (U.S. Patent No. 4,127,365). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the rejection, claims 28 and 32 each have been amended to recite that the first set of threaded fasteners separately attach said adapter body to said motor drive assembly and that the second set of threaded fasteners separately attach the adapter body to

the pump assembly. The claims also recites the feature of at least one registration pin that provides radial alignment of the adapter body relative to the pump assembly.

Veyrat fails to disclose at least these aforementioned aspects of claims 28 and 32. To the contrary, Veyrat discloses a single set of support bolts 42 that affix the motor end plate to the support 40 and the support 40 to the pump assembly. Veyrat does not however disclose first and second sets of threaded fasteners. Moreover, Veyrat fails to disclose that the first set of threaded fasteners separately attach the adapter body to the motor drive assembly wherein the second set of threaded fasteners separately attach the adapter body to the pump assembly. Still yet, Veyrat fails to disclose the use of at least one registration pin that provides radial alignment of the adapter body relative to the pump assembly. See, for example, Figure 3 of Veyrat.

Various embodiments of Applicant's invention as described in the specification provide a convenient alignment apparatus for a pump drive system. In particular, an adapter body is used which is interposed between the motor drive system and the pump itself. In practice, operators frequently need to remove a motor drive system for servicing or other purposes. Therefore, it is desirable to have a quick and easy way to remove the motor drive system without having to disassemble the entire pump assembly. It is also very important that the output shaft of the motor drive system be in aligned co-axial radial position with the input shaft of the pump.

Thus, in cases of detachable motor drive systems, a relatively laborious alignment process was required where both the pump and the motor were each affixed to a common base. Similarly, a laborious disassembly and assembly of the motor drive system and pump system was involved with prior pump systems as the motor drive system and the pump system, could not be disconnected one another from without disassembling the entire apparatus. The present

invention overcomes this disadvantage by separately attaching the pump assembly and motor assembly to the adapter assembly via a first and second sets of fasteners, respectively.

Turning now to Martin, Applicant respectfully submits that it fails to remedy the aforementioned deficiencies in Veyrat. While the Office Action alleges that Martin discloses an adapter body, Applicant respectfully submits that it does not appear to be detachable in the claimed manner. Moreover, it is not seen to have any alignment features.

Claims 29 and 30 depend from amended claim 28 and are believed allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Claims 33 and 34 depend from amended claim 32 and are believed allowable for at least this reason.

Accordingly, in light of remarks set forth above withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

(2) Claims 31 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Veyrat (U.S. Patent No. 4,797,071) in view of Martin (U.S. Patent No. 4,127,365) and in further view of Klauck. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As previously discussed in connection with the prior 103 rejection, Veyrat and Martin fail to teach or suggest all the features of claim 32. Claims 31 and 35 depend from claim 32 and therefore recite in part that the first set of threaded fasteners separately attach said adapter body to said motor drive assembly and that the second set of threaded fasteners separately attach the adapter body to the pump assembly and at least one registration pin that provides radial alignment of the adapter body relative to the pump assembly. Klauck fails to remedy the previously discussed deficiencies of Veyrat and Martin and simply discloses a central body for connecting a drive motor to a pump.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

This Amendment merely requires only a cursory review by the Examiner and does not necessitate a new search, raise the issue of new matter, present additional claims or otherwise introduce new issues. Moreover, it is believed that this Amendment expedites the resolution of the of the above-identified matter. Further, it is noted that an Appeal Brief has not been filed and this Amendment is being filed within the time period for filing the brief and is believed to place the claims in patentable condition.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the application are believed in order. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (202) 861-1696.

Any additional extension of time necessary to prevent abandonment is hereby requested, and any fee necessary for consideration of this response is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2036.

Respectfully submitted,

**BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP**



Stephen S. Fabry  
Registration No. 51,661

Date: April 17, 2008  
Washington Square, Suite 1100  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: 202 861 1500  
Fax: 202 861 1783